

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **6 October 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29 and 31-39. Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29, and 31-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Wu et al. (US Pub. No. 2005/0033726 hereinafter “Wu”), and further in view of Gary Willman Policastro (US Pub. No. 2003/0018605 hereinafter “Policastro”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 14, and 27 were rejected as being anticipated by Wu in view of Policastro. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Wu and Policastro teaches using a metadata view module to **abstract and present to a user data** from different native data sources (see Wu, page 1, paragraphs [0008]-[0009], see Wu, page 1, paragraph [0012], and see Wu, page 3, paragraph [0042]). Note that Wu uses the metadata view module as a tool to facilitate **generating business views**, but is not specifically concerned with metadata (see Wu, page 3, paragraph [0035]). These business views are **structured summaries of data**, which Wu creates for presentation purposes (see Wu, page 3, paragraph [0040], lines 9-12). Wu does not teach producing data, metadata, or altering the storage of data (see Wu, page 3, paragraph [0040], lines 5-9). Furthermore, note that Wu’s teachings on security are limited to placing restrictions on data views (see Wu, page 3, paragraph [0042], lines 2-5, and see Wu, page 4, paragraph [0053]).

In contrast, the present invention teaches a method for **securing and manipulating metadata** in a database (see page 3, paragraph [0009], see page 4, paragraph [0010], lines 1-2, and see page 9, paragraph [0037], lines 1-2 of the instant application). Note that securing metadata is not equivalent to controlling who can view a business view. For example, assume an organization has a database of numbers. Following Wu, the organization can control who views the

numbers. In contrast, the present invention enables the organization to control who accesses metadata associated with the numbers. For example, the present invention can control who can access the metadata that describes the numbers as purchase order numbers. Without access to the metadata that describes the numbers as purchase order numbers, a user would not find the numbers data very useful. The present invention enables an organization to secure the metadata associated with data. This is advantageous because organizations often overlook securing metadata when designing a system to secure data.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 to clarify that the present invention teaches moving the metadata into a collection, thereby securing the metadata. These amendments find support in paragraphs [0009]-[0010], and in paragraph [0037] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3, and 5-13, which depend upon claim 1, claims 15-16, and 18-26, which depend upon claim 14, and claims 28-29, and 31-39, which depend upon claim 27, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: 18 October 2006

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665
Email: edward@parklegal.com